



## Re: Three petitions

1 message

Tue, May 5, 2015 at 4:17 PM

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>  
Cc: "Yegparian, Garen" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Thanks so much - digging in.

Did the petition first so that I might save Eugene some duplication of effort. Working on the rest. Miranda also gave me some non-substantive edits today (a couple of typos and a couple of suggested wording changes) that I'll incorporate as well.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 3:35 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara,

Yes, to the course of action you mentioned above.

The parcel with the ownership question is 5139020025.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 3:31 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Starting with the easier...

#3 - for which APN or APNs does the ownership still reflect Meruelo Maddux? I'm not clear from your original email. I will contact the owner and see if they can provide a deed or closing papers. In the meantime, I also want to take the parcel(s) out of our % tally. Thanks!

#1 - We had to do some digging, and you are correct - this is an error. We think we know how it occurred. It appears to have happened during one of our January versions of the database. When reviewing our data, Garen got a different frontage calculation (638) than we did; we redid our calculation and reduced the frontage from 696 to 645. **645 was mistakenly input into the FComm column, rather than updating the 696 in FGovt.** As a result, the formulas swept both numbers up and added them together. We are glad to catch this now, and deeply regret the error.

I assume we should:

- update all figures/tables/public parcels section/parcel rolls in MDP and ER
- update database

- regenerate petition and ship to Miranda/Eugene (I believe Miranda signed off yesterday and asked Eugene to have Holly sign)

This will not affect assessments for other parcels, but it will affect their percentage (this will be statistically significant) so we'll push to exceed the petition threshold by an amount at least equal to to the City's drop.

Please confirm if the above is the correct/complete course of action.

We will probably need until tomorrow to make all these changes, but I believe we can get everything in.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 2:30 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara, thanks for the quick reply.

#1 I'll wait for your results on that.

#2 Yes, please update the data and the MDP/ER

#3 Unfortunately, we can't accept news articles as proof of ownership. A deed, closing papers, some property reports are things we can review and accept if deemed valid. Fortunately, this particular parcel isn't that much % loss if you can't get those things during the petition drive.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 2:05 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Of course. I have mostly cleared my plate through Thursday to put SPII first, and will endeavor to reply to everything very quickly. Answers below.

#1 - Let me review calculations and get back to you shortly.

#2 - Thank you; we weren't aware that these parcels were combined, but it makes sense as they are planned for development; Should we go ahead and make the change in the database? Should we also update the parcel rolls in MDP/ER?

#3 - Yes, neither Meruelo Maddux nor its successor, EVOQ, has owned any of these properties for some time. These parcels have had a complex change, which I can support with the news articles cited below:

a) As you may have read in the news a few years ago, MM went into bankruptcy - Meruelo and Maddox were ousted and the firm emerged as EVOQ under entirely new leadership: [http://www.ladowntownnews.com/news/where-meruelo-maddux-failed-evoq-hopes-to-thrive/article\\_cb3e692c-14cc-11e2-b18f-001a4bcf887a.html](http://www.ladowntownnews.com/news/where-meruelo-maddux-failed-evoq-hopes-to-thrive/article_cb3e692c-14cc-11e2-b18f-001a4bcf887a.html)

b) In late 2103: EVOQ sold these properties to Mack Urban: <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/oct/02/business/la-fi-property-report-20131003>

DTLA South Park Properties is the correct owner of record for these parcels per owner Mack Urban. They do not know why the change has not been recorded since the sale occurred about 18 months ago. It appears that some of their parcel changes were recorded and others not!

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 1:21 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara, Garen has been off this week so I'm going through the petitions.

I have a question about City owned parcel 5139019900 (the Public Works Bldg). How did you come up with 1,341' frontage? The parcel only has a total of 637' total street frontage. I noticed in the frontage columns there is FComm = 645' and FGovt = 696', It's obvious that those two were added to get 1,341', but what are they, and I don't see how you can come up with a total that's more than the entire parcel's street frontage.

The next issue is that there are more parcels that have been combined. 5139024003, 014 & 015 are now 017. The good news is that the ownership, bldg sqft, frontage, and land area is the same as before.

The last issue is that one of the petitions has DTLA South Park Properties on it, but the County has Meruelo Maddux 336 W 11th St LLC. Has there been a recent ownership change that you know of?

I don't have to say that we are in an extreme time crunch, please get back to me as you as you can.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 10:41 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Attached please find the three additional petitions I alluded to in yesterday's email. The ownership listed is current and correct, but I am not sure if your data will match and we may need to furnish additional documentation. Please let me know about any problem petitions as soon as you are able. (The attached ones are the ones I'm most concerned about.)

Thanks!

--

Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
213-978-1120

--

Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
213-978-1120

--

Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
213-978-1120





---

## Re: Three petitions

1 message

Thu, May 7, 2015 at 10:39 AM

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>  
Cc: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Dennis, attached please find a purchase and sale agreement. We hope this will establish ownership for the parcel below.

Please let me know if this suffices. Meruelo Maddux went into bankruptcy and emerged as EVOQ (MM leadership was ousted and the company rebranded itself as EVOQ.) EVOQ sold to the current owner, Mack Urban, whose holdings in the district fall under 3 LLCs as noted on the petitions.

On May 5, 2015 3:35 PM, "Dennis Rader" <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara,

Yes, to the course of action you mentioned above.

The parcel with the ownership question is 5139020025.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 3:31 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Starting with the easier...

#3 - for which APN or APNs does the ownership still reflect Meruelo Maddux? I'm not clear from your original email. I will contact the owner and see if they can provide a deed or closing papers. In the meantime, I also want to take the parcel(s) out of our % tally. Thanks!

#1 - We had to do some digging, and you are correct - this is an error. We think we know how it occurred. It appears to have happened during one of our January versions of the database. When reviewing our data, Garen got a different frontage calculation (638) than we did; we redid our calculation and reduced the frontage from 696 to 645. **645 was mistakenly input into the FComm column, rather than updating the 696 in FGovt.** As a result, the formulas swept both numbers up and added them together. We are glad to catch this now, and deeply regret the error.

I assume we should:

- update all figures/tables/public parcels section/parcel rolls in MDP and ER
- update database

- regenerate petition and ship to Miranda/Eugene (I believe Miranda signed off yesterday and asked Eugene to have Holly sign)

This will not affect assessments for other parcels, but it will affect their percentage (this will be statistically significant) so we'll push to exceed the petition threshold by an amount at least equal to to the City's drop.

Please confirm if the above is the correct/complete course of action.

We will probably need until tomorrow to make all these changes, but I believe we can get everything in.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 2:30 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara, thanks for the quick reply.

#1 I'll wait for your results on that.

#2 Yes, please update the data and the MDP/ER

#3 Unfortunately, we can't accept news articles as proof of ownership. A deed, closing papers, some property reports are things we can review and accept if deemed valid. Fortunately, this particular parcel isn't that much % loss if you can't get those things during the petition drive.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 2:05 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Of course. I have mostly cleared my plate through Thursday to put SPII first, and will endeavor to reply to everything very quickly. Answers below.

#1 - Let me review calculations and get back to you shortly.

#2 - Thank you; we weren't aware that these parcels were combined, but it makes sense as they are planned for development; Should we go ahead and make the change in the database? Should we also update the parcel rolls in MDP/ER?

#3 - Yes, neither Meruelo Maddux nor its successor, EVOQ, has owned any of these properties for some time. These parcels have had a complex change, which I can support with the news articles cited below:

a) As you may have read in the news a few years ago, MM went into bankruptcy - Meruelo and Maddox were ousted and the firm emerged as EVOQ under entirely new leadership: [http://www.ladowntownnews.com/news/where-meruelo-maddux-failed-evoq-hopes-to-thrive/article\\_cb3e692c-14cc-11e2-b18f-001a4bcf887a.html](http://www.ladowntownnews.com/news/where-meruelo-maddux-failed-evoq-hopes-to-thrive/article_cb3e692c-14cc-11e2-b18f-001a4bcf887a.html)

b) In late 2103: EVOQ sold these properties to Mack Urban: <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/oct/02/business/la-fi-property-report-20131003>

DTLA South Park Properties is the correct owner of record for these parcels per owner Mack Urban. They do not know why the change has not been recorded since the sale occurred about 18 months ago. It appears that some of their parcel changes were recorded and others not!

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 1:21 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara, Garen has been off this week so I'm going through the petitions.

I have a question about City owned parcel 5139019900 (the Public Works Bldg). How did you come up with 1,341' frontage? The parcel only has a total of 637' total street frontage. I noticed in the frontage columns there is FComm = 645' and FGovt = 696', It's obvious that those two were added to get 1,341', but what are they, and I don't see how you can come up with a total that's more than the entire parcel's street frontage.

The next issue is that there are more parcels that have been combined. 5139024003, 014 & 015 are now 017. The good news is that the ownership, bldg sqft, frontage, and land area is the same as before.

The last issue is that one of the petitions has DTLA South Park Properties on it, but the County has Meruelo Maddux 336 W 11th St LLC. Has there been a recent ownership change that you know of?

I don't have to say that we are in an extreme time crunch, please get back to me as you as you can.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 10:41 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Attached please find the three additional petitions I alluded to in yesterday's email. The ownership listed is current and correct, but I am not sure if your data will match and we may need to furnish additional documentation. Please let me know about any problem petitions as soon as you are able. (The attached ones are the ones I'm most concerned about.)

Thanks!


--

Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
213-978-1120

--  
Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
213-978-1120

--  
Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
213-978-1120

---

 **EVOQ - South Park - Purchase Agreement - KW-Urban Partners (v7) FULLY EX (75231252\_1).pdf**  
1136K







---

## Re: Three petitions

1 message

Thu, May 7, 2015 at 10:41 AM

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>  
Cc: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

P.S. The sale agreement is with Urban Partners. Shortly after this sale, Urban Partners (LA) merged with Mack Real Estate Group (NY) to form Mack Urban.

On May 7, 2015 10:39 AM, "Tara Devine" <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Dennis, attached please find a purchase and sale agreement. We hope this will establish ownership for the parcel below.

Please let me know if this suffices. Meruelo Maddux went into bankruptcy and emerged as EVOQ (MM leadership was ousted and the company rebranded itself as EVOQ.) EVOQ sold to the current owner, Mack Urban, whose holdings in the district fall under 3 LLCs as noted on the petitions.

On May 5, 2015 3:35 PM, "Dennis Rader" <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara,  
Yes, to the course of action you mentioned above.  
The parcel with the ownership question is 5139020025.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 3:31 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:  
Starting with the easier...

#3 - for which APN or APNs does the ownership still reflect Meruelo Maddux? I'm not clear from your original email. I will contact the owner and see if they can provide a deed or closing papers. In the meantime, I also want to take the parcel(s) out of our % tally. Thanks!

#1 - We had to do some digging, and you are correct - this is an error. We think we know how it occurred. It appears to have happened during one of our January versions of the database. When reviewing our data, Garen got a different frontage calculation (638) than we did; we redid our calculation and reduced the frontage from 696 to 645. **645 was mistakenly input into the FComm column, rather than updating the 696 in FGovt.** As a result, the formulas swept both numbers up and added them together. We are glad to catch this now, and deeply regret the error.

I assume we should:

- update all figures/tables/public parcels section/parcel rolls in MDP and ER
- update database
- regenerate petition and ship to Miranda/Eugene (I believe Miranda signed off yesterday and asked Eugene to have Holly sign)

This will not affect assessments for other parcels, but it will affect their percentage (this will be statistically significant) so we'll push to exceed the petition threshold by an amount at least equal to to the City's drop.

Please confirm if the above is the correct/complete course of action.

We will probably need until tomorrow to make all these changes, but I believe we can get everything in.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 2:30 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara, thanks for the quick reply.

#1 I'll wait for your results on that.

#2 Yes, please update the data and the MDP/ER

#3 Unfortunately, we can't accept news articles as proof of ownership. A deed, closing papers, some property reports are things we can review and accept if deemed valid. Fortunately, this particular parcel isn't that much % loss if you can't get those things during the petition drive.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 2:05 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Of course. I have mostly cleared my plate through Thursday to put SPII first, and will endeavor to reply to everything very quickly. Answers below.

#1 - Let me review calculations and get back to you shortly.

#2 - Thank you; we weren't aware that these parcels were combined, but it makes sense as they are planned for development; Should we go ahead and make the change in the database? Should we also update the parcel rolls in MDP/ER?

#3 - Yes, neither Meruelo Maddux nor its successor, EVOQ, has owned any of these properties for some time. These parcels have had a complex change, which I can support with the news articles cited below:

a) As you may have read in the news a few years ago, MM went into bankruptcy - Meruelo and Maddox were ousted and the firm emerged as EVOQ under entirely new leadership: [http://www.ladowntownnews.com/news/where-meruelo-maddux-failed-voq-hopes-to-thrive/article\\_cb3e692c-14cc-11e2-b18f-001a4bcf887a.html](http://www.ladowntownnews.com/news/where-meruelo-maddux-failed-voq-hopes-to-thrive/article_cb3e692c-14cc-11e2-b18f-001a4bcf887a.html)

b) In late 2103: EVOQ sold these properties to Mack Urban: <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/oct/02/business/la-fi-property-report-20131003>

DTLA South Park Properties is the correct owner of record for these parcels per owner Mack Urban. They do not know why the change has not been recorded since the sale occurred about 18 months ago. It appears that some of their parcel changes were recorded and others not!

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 1:21 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara, Garen has been off this week so I'm going through the petitions.

I have a question about City owned parcel 5139019900 (the Public Works Bldg). How did you come up with 1,341' frontage? The parcel only has a total of 637' total street frontage. I noticed in the frontage columns there is FComm = 645' and FGovt = 696', It's obvious that those two were added to get 1,341', but what are they, and I don't see how you can come up with a total that's more than the entire parcel's street frontage.

The next issue is that there are more parcels that have been combined. 5139024003, 014 & 015 are now 017. The good news is that the ownership, bldg sqft, frontage, and land area is the same as before.

The last issue is that one of the petitions has DTLA South Park Properties on it, but the County has Meruelo Maddux 336 W 11th St LLC. Has there been a recent ownership change that you know of?

I don't have to say that we are in an extreme time crunch, please get back to me as you as you can.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 10:41 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Attached please find the three additional petitions I alluded to in yesterday's email. The ownership listed is current and correct, but I am not sure if your data will match and we may need to furnish additional documentation. Please let me know about any problem petitions as soon as you are able. (The attached ones are the ones I'm most concerned about.)

Thanks!

--  
Dennis Rader

Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
213-978-1120

--

Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
213-978-1120

--

Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
213-978-1120





## Re: Three petitions

1 message

Thu, May 7, 2015 at 11:08 AM

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>  
To: Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>  
Cc: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

I already have. They contacted their title company three days ago and again today have not gotten a reply.

They have searched their offices and this is what they have been able to find so far. They're being very helpful but I sense they are frustrated.

On May 7, 2015 10:51 AM, "Dennis Rader" <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara, a purchase and sale agreement isn't proof of transfer of ownership. Wouldn't it be possible for you to communicate with your contacts at the new owner company to get the appropriate documents?

On Thu, May 7, 2015 at 10:39 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Dennis, attached please find a purchase and sale agreement. We hope this will establish ownership for the parcel below.

Please let me know if this suffices. Meruelo Maddux went into bankruptcy and emerged as EVOQ (MM leadership was ousted and the company rebranded itself as EVOQ.) EVOQ sold to the current owner, Mack Urban, whose holdings in the district fall under 3 LLCs as noted on the petitions.

On May 5, 2015 3:35 PM, "Dennis Rader" <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara,  
Yes, to the course of action you mentioned above.  
The parcel with the ownership question is 5139020025.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 3:31 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:  
Starting with the easier...

#3 - for which APN or APNs does the ownership still reflect Meruelo Maddux? I'm not clear from your original email. I will contact the owner and see if they can provide a deed or closing papers. In the meantime, I also want to take the parcel(s) out of our % tally. Thanks!

#1 - We had to do some digging, and you are correct - this is an error. We think we know how it occurred. It appears to have happened during one of our January versions of the database. When reviewing our data, Garen got a different frontage calculation (638) than we did; we redid our calculation and reduced the frontage from 696 to 645. **645 was mistakenly input into the FComm column, rather than updating the 696 in FGovt.** As a result, the formulas swept both numbers up and added them together. We are glad to catch this now, and deeply regret the error.

I assume we should:

- update all figures/tables/public parcels section/parcel rolls in MDP and ER
- update database
- regenerate petition and ship to Miranda/Eugene (I believe Miranda signed off yesterday and asked Eugene to have Holly sign)

This will not affect assessments for other parcels, but it will affect their percentage (this will be statistically significant) so we'll push to exceed the petition threshold by an amount at least equal to to the City's drop.

Please confirm if the above is the correct/complete course of action.

We will probably need until tomorrow to make all these changes, but I believe we can get everything in.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 2:30 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:  
Tara, thanks for the quick reply.

#1 I'll wait for your results on that.

#2 Yes, please update the data and the MDP/ER

#3 Unfortunately, we can't accept news articles as proof of ownership. A deed, closing papers, some property reports are things we can review and accept if deemed valid. Fortunately, this particular parcel isn't that much % loss if you can't get those things during the petition drive.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 2:05 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:  
Of course. I have mostly cleared my plate through Thursday to put SPII first, and will endeavor to reply to everything very quickly. Answers below.

#1 - Let me review calculations and get back to you shortly.

#2 - Thank you; we weren't aware that these parcels were combined, but it makes sense as they are planned for development; Should we go ahead and make the change in the database? Should we also update the parcel rolls in MDP/ER?

#3 - Yes, neither Meruelo Maddux nor its successor, EVOQ, has owned any of these properties for some time. These parcels have had a complex change, which I can support with the news articles cited below:

a) As you may have read in the news a few years ago, MM went into bankruptcy - Meruelo and Maddox were ousted and the firm emerged as EVOQ under entirely new leadership:

[http://www.ladowntownnews.com/news/where-meruelo-maddux-failed-evoq-hopes-to-thrive/article\\_cb3e692c-14cc-11e2-b18f-001a4bcf887a.html](http://www.ladowntownnews.com/news/where-meruelo-maddux-failed-evoq-hopes-to-thrive/article_cb3e692c-14cc-11e2-b18f-001a4bcf887a.html)

b) In late 2103: EVOQ sold these properties to Mack Urban: <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/oct/02/business/la-fi-property-report-20131003>

DTLA South Park Properties is the correct owner of record for these parcels per owner Mack Urban. They do not know why the change has not been recorded since the sale occurred about 18 months ago. It appears that some of their parcel changes were recorded and others not!

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 1:21 PM, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org> wrote:

Tara, Garen has been off this week so I'm going through the petitions.

I have a question about City owned parcel 5139019900 (the Public Works Bldg). How did you come up with 1,341' frontage? The parcel only has a total of 637' total street frontage. I noticed in the frontage columns there is FComm = 645' and FGovt = 696', It's obvious that those two were added to get 1,341', but what are they, and I don't see how you can come up with a total that's more than the entire parcel's street frontage.

The next issue is that there are more parcels that have been combined. 5139024003, 014 & 015 are now 017. The good news is that the ownership, bldg sqft, frontage, and land area is the same as before.

The last issue is that one of the petitions has DTLA South Park Properties on it, but the County has Meruelo Maddux 336 W 11th St LLC. Has there been a recent ownership change that you know of?

I don't have to say that we are in an extreme time crunch, please get back to me as you as you can.

On Tue, May 5, 2015 at 10:41 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Attached please find the three additional petitions I alluded to in yesterday's email. The ownership listed is current and correct, but I am not sure if your data will match and we may need to furnish additional documentation. Please let me know about any problem petitions as soon as you are able. (The attached ones are the ones I'm most concerned about.)

Thanks!

--

Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
213-978-1120

--

Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
213-978-1120

--

Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
213-978-1120

--

Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
213-978-1120

